

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-2532

SAMUEL B. DAVIS, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RICHARD W. HUDGINS; MCKINLEY SIMMONS; HOWARD
C. ANDLETON; JAMES M. DIXON; TIMOTHY L.
DALTON; JAMES STEPHEN ELLENSON; CLYDE M.
WEAVER; LAWRENCE J. REDDING, III; ROBERT D.
HICKS; RANDELL C. OGG; J. W. HORNSBY, JR.;
UNKNOWN CONSPIRATORS,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 96-1126

SAMUEL B. DAVIS, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RICHARD W. HUDGINS; MCKINLEY SIMMONS; HOWARD
C. ANDLETON; JAMES M. DIXON; TIMOTHY L.
DALTON; JAMES STEPHEN ELLENSON; CLYDE M.
WEAVER; LAWRENCE J. REDDING, III; ROBERT D.
HICKS; RANDELL C. OGG; J. W. HORNSBY, JR.;
UNKNOWN CONSPIRATORS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca B. Smith, District Judge. (CA-94-163-4)

Submitted: May 7, 1996

Decided: June 14, 1996

Before HALL, MURNAGHAN, and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Samuel B. Davis, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. John Franklin, III, Brian Nelson Casey, TAYLOR & WALKER, P.C., Norfolk, Virginia; James Stephen Ellenson, Newport News, Virginia; Robert William McFarland, Richard Joshua Cromwell, MCGUIRE, WOODS, BATTLE & BOOTHE, Norfolk, Virginia; William Mark Dunn, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia; Willard Montellous Robinson, Jr., Newport News, Virginia; Robert D. Hicks, Gloucester, Virginia; Randell C. Ogg, SHERMAN, MEEHAN & CURTIN, P.C., Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals from the district court's orders dismissing his complaint alleging violations of the Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C.A. § 1961-1968 (West 1985 & Supp. 1995), and civil rights statutes 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986, 1988 (1988), and imposing FED. R. CIV. P. 11 sanctions. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Davis v. Hudgins, No. CA-94-163-4 (E.D. Va. Aug. 7 & Dec. 27, 1995). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED